

Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1-38 remain pending.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the time afforded applicants' attorney, Blanche E. Schiller, during a telephonic interview with Examiner John Romano and Supervisor Wei Zhen on March 30, 2005. During that telephonic interview, claims 1 & 2 were discussed, and in particular, the attaching of debug information to a transaction. It was described that the debug information is attached to the transaction, instead of a server as in the prior art, in order to enable the transaction to be moved from processor to processor without having to know in advance where the transaction is going to execute and to eliminate pre-registration at the various processors. It was requested by the Examiners, during the telephonic interview, to amend claim 1 to further define the attachment. With the above amendments, applicants have complied with this request, in a *bona fide* attempt to further prosecution of this application and not in acquiescence to the rejection. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification (e.g., FIG. 2, page 3, paragraph 0006; page 6, paragraph 18; pages 8-10), and thus, no new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request that if a further telephonic interview would expedite prosecution, that the Examiner contact applicants' attorney, as soon as possible.

In the Office Action, dated February 10, 2005, claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Davidson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,042,614). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse this rejection to any extent deemed applicable to the amended claims for the reasons below.

As one aspect of the present invention, a capability is provided for facilitating the debugging of a transaction across multiple processors. As one example, debug information is attached to a transaction, so that the debug information follows the transaction from processor to processor without requiring a predefinition of the path of the transaction and without requiring a debug registration process at each processor of the multiple processors. Registration is performed, for example, only at the processor at which the transaction originates. It is not performed at the other processors that subsequently execute the transaction. This enables a developer to trace all parts of the transaction, even when it is not known where the transaction

will execute. This is especially helpful in loadbalancing, etc., when it is not known beforehand all of the processors in which a particular transaction is going to execute.

In one particular example, applicants claim a method of facilitating debugging of transactions (e.g., independent claim 1). The method includes, for instance, executing a transaction on one processor of a plurality of processors, said transaction having debug information attached to the transaction; and requesting, by said transaction, a service on another processor of said plurality of processors, wherein said attached debug information is passed with the transaction from the one processor to the another processor eliminating a need for attaching the debug information at the another processor, and wherein a path of the transaction is not predefined to a controller of the debugging. Thus, in this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, debug information is explicitly attached to the transaction, instead of to the processor. Further, the attached debug information passes from processor to processor along with the transaction. This eliminates the need for attaching the debug information to a processor or for pre-registration of the debug information at the various processors in which a transaction may execute. This is very different from the teachings of Davidson.

While Davidson describes a system and method for providing a distributed debugger system for a distributed target computer application, Davidson fails to describe, teach or suggest one or more aspects of applicants' claimed invention. For example, Davidson fails to describe, teach or suggest that the debug information is attached to the transaction. Instead, in Davidson, the debug engine is attached to the server, as explicitly recited in column 11, lines 63-65, of Davidson:

The wrapper server 510 on the local host 520 sends a message to the wrapper server on the remote host 522 requesting that a dbx engine be created on the remote host 522 and be instructed to attach to the server 516.

Further, in column 12, Davidson states:

The dbx-engine 504 on the client cannot send the breakpoint message to the dbx-engine 512 on the server until that dbx-engine 512 has been full started (i.e., it has gone through its initialization including connection to the debugger-gui and has attached to the server). Col. 12, lines 20-24.

Thus, in Davidson, the dbx-engine is attached to the server. There is no discussion at all in Davidson of attaching debug information to a transaction. Since Davidson teaches that the debug engine is to be attached to a server and fails to describe, teach or suggest attaching debug information to the transaction, applicants respectfully submit that Davidson does not anticipate applicants' claimed invention.

Moreover, since Davidson teaches that the debug engine is attached to the server, and there is no description whatsoever of attaching the debug information to the transaction, applicants respectfully submit that Davidson fails to describe, teach or suggest applicants' claimed element of wherein the attached debug information is passed with the transaction from the one processor to the another processor, eliminating a need for attaching the debug information at the another processor. This is not described, taught or suggested in Davidson. Further, Davidson explicitly teaches away from this by specifying in multiple places that the debug engine is to be attached to the server. Since Davidson teaches the opposite of what is being claimed by applicants, applicants respectfully submit that their invention is patentable over Davidson.

For all the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as well as the other independent claims, are patentable over Davidson. Further, applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are patentable over Davidson for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features. For example, dependent claim 10 indicates that the tracing can continue without performing a debug registration process between the client workstation and the another processor. This is very different from the teachings of Davidson. In Davidson, each server that is to perform debugging needs to attach the debug engine to its server (see, e.g., column 11, lines 63-65; column 12, lines 20-24). This is in contrast to applicants' claimed invention in which a debug registration process is not necessary on the another processor, since the debug information is passed along with the transaction from processor to processor. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that their invention is patentable over Davidson.

For all the above reasons, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller
Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: April 14, 2005.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579